Braun, M., Back from the Future, *AM Journal*, No. 27, 2022, 149–159.

doi: 10.25038/am.v0i27.498

Micha Braun
Institut für Theaterwissenschaft, Universität Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany

Back from the Future: Theatre and Performance in Central Eastern Europe Beyond the Anthropocene, 1920–Today

Abstract: Theatre is and has always been a practice of imagination – especially of alternative worlds, spaces, and futures. This does not only apply to theatre and performance in its well-established and acknowledged forms, but even more to non-conformist or experimental practices that deal with repressive, authoritarian regimes or with a perception of crisis in general. At least since the historical avant-gardes of the early 20th century, an outlook onto alternative futures that can handle or even overcome these crises has been a regular feature of theatre and performance practice.
A particularly imaginative approach within such projections features notions of a human-less time and space – a world beyond the Anthropos. The resulting notions of a deserted world, of a continuing (and perhaps flourishing) ecosystem, or a lifeless wasteland 'populated' only by objects, robots, or other remnants, can be perceived as an expression of a certain awareness of a world in peril – ecologically, politically, and socially – already in their time of origin.
Utilizing a comparative approach, my paper examines several instances of those theatrical practices between the historical avant-garde, the neo-avant-garde and the present time, with a special focus on Central Eastern Europe. Exemplary projects and works like Karel Čapek's drama *R.U.R.* (1920 with several stagings in the following years), or Paweł Althamer's social experiment *Common Task* (2009 ff.) will be introduced as well as the conceptual perspective of *Reism* (thing-ism), formulated by the Slovenian group OHO (around Marko Pogačnik, 1966 ff.). From the common viewpoint of the mentioned projects – back from a future beyond the Anthropocene – a radically different relationship to the world, nature, and the subject arises: instead of an anthropocentric mastery over the world, a more or less non-hierarchical way of dealing with subjects, objects, animals and people can be observed.

Keywords: performance art; body art; (post-)communist condition; community projects; alternative orders; reism; finiteness; Paweł Althamer; OHO Group; Karel Čapek.

*Author contact information: mibraun@uni-leipzig.de

Back from the Future? Imaginations from Elsewhere

The title of this paper is a borrowed one: In 2003, the German-Russian philosopher, collector and art critic Boris Groys gave it to an essay dealing with the distinction, as necessary as it is arbitrary, between art from Western and from Eastern Europe. In other words, he asked to what extent Eastern European art of his time – which often pursued the same aesthetic and political questions as its Western counterpart – can or must be understood as a specific expression of its present and past contexts of emergence and reception. The essential criterion in his view is that of their historical context: "for it is surely quite evident to all concerned that the true specificity of Eastern Europe can only reside in its communist past"[1]. I will argue that the specificity and the distinctiveness of this addressed past can also help us today for our considerations of an ecological-dystopian imbalance after the proclaimed 'end of history', in order to gain perspectives for a variety of possible futures.

Groys concluded in his brief analysis: "Communist-ruled societies might by all means have been hermetically closed societies but they were also utterly modern, asserting the credo of progress even more aggressively […] than liberal democracies in the West."[2] Accordingly, this 'Eastern' form of modernity has persistently created its own radical or avant-garde movements that insulated themselves against their respective surroundings under the banner of some universal future. "Once they have dispersed, what such modern, yet closed, communities *leave behind them* is not the past *but the future*."[3] In other words, post-communist societies took a route from enclosure to openness in quite the opposite direction than that which a normative Western development theory would grant them. This positioning "*against the flow of time*"[4] and the related view 'from elsewhere' seem interesting to me not only for an art context, but also for a general perception of current social and political issues. If there is not only a thinking and perception of identity and agency from the past via the present into the future, but also a reversed approach that takes an alienating look at the present from the perspective of the future, what can it teach us for our own understanding of a future-oriented agency? And, if the post-communist condition is one of return, de-growth and retreat, might it help us work out practices or strategies to address urgent challenges after the return of this historical paradigm in the figure of the Anthropocene?

In order to address these questions, this paper will examine several instances of theatre and performance practices between the historical avant-garde, the post-war neo-avant-garde and the post-communist time, especially from Central Eastern Europe, in order to identify such strategies that may give us a certain perspective from or on a future 'Beyond the Anthropocene'. In doing so, I will take up Groys' proposition

[1] Boris Groys, "Back from the Future," *Third Text* 17, 4 (2003): 324f.

[2] Ibid., 326.

[3] Ibid., 327. My italics.

[4] Ibid. My italics.

and dive through the material 'against the flow of time'. The following papers of my colleagues Veronika Darian and Michael Wehren will then pick up several clues from the past that could help to take yet another different look at our present time.

Landscapes, Things and Astronauts: Communal/Group Practice in Search for an Alternative Order

I will start with some rather contemporary works by Paweł Althamer, who is considered to be one of the key figures of the Polish art scene of the 1990s and early 2000s, due to his approach to body and community art. During his studies at the Warsaw Academy of Fine Arts – in a period of radical social and political transformation in the early 1990s – he found his way in dealing with these experiences in communicative and realistic games as the basis of a communal experience, an aspect that is still present in his work.

Early on, Althamer sought for social situations that include or rather confront the experience of nature with the questioning of the exceptionality – or rather solitude – of mankind. In his graduation piece from 1993, for example, a sculptural self-portrait replaced Althamer during the defense of his master's degree. A video was played showing the artist leaving the academy, heading towards the woods to strip off his clothes and "commune with nature". In another untitled piece from 1991, he froze, isolated in a white costume, motionless in the snow-covered landscape around Dłużewo, losing all his sentience and sensibility in the cold.[5] The art critic Jarosław Lubiak wrote about these actions: "Not only does [he] leave the reality of the art academy context, but he also leaves the reality of the city, and indeed *of all culture*, to disappear into nature. And he disappears *in order to return […] transformed*, which was to become a permanent motif in his later works."[6]

Such transgression of physical limitations, journeys through time and space, as well as ritual and archaic self-experience are bundled in his figure of the shaman, which served the anthropologically interested artist as inspiration – not at last to be found in the actual figure of the little goat *Matołek* from a famous Polish children's book, who undertakes long journeys but always arrives at home in the end.[7]

Another recurring figure in Althamer's work is the astronaut – a character (or a mask) that refers to exploration and to a stranger who makes observations from a

[5] For these and other works of the 1990s see Andrzej Przywara, "Paweł Althamer," in *Na wolności w końcu – Sztuka polska po 1989 roku*, ed. by Dorota Monkiewicz and Dirk Teuber (Baden-Baden, Warsaw: Staatliche Kunsthalle Baden-Baden, Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, 2000), 23–28.

[6] Jarosław Lubiak, "Paweł Althamer," in *Nowe zjawiska w sztuce polskiej po 2000 roku*, ed. by Grzegorz Borkowski, Adam Mazur, and Monika Branicka (Warsaw: CSW Zamek Ujazdowski, 2008), 158. My italics.

[7] For images and descriptions of these journeys, where Althamer actually wore the costume of the little goat, see for example Agnieszka Sural, "11 Greatest Works of Paweł Althamer," https://culture.pl/en/article/11-greatest-works-of-pawel-althamer, or the online documentation of the 2014 exhibition *Co widać / As you can see* at the Muzeum sztuki nowoczesnej w Warszawie, acc. on January 20, 2022, http://cowidac.artmuseum.pl/en/artist/pawel-althamer.

time and space quite remote from the here and now. In the action *Kosmonaut* from 1995, an astronaut enters a small Polish town, films his surroundings with a video camera and simultaneously shows the film on a monitor mounted on his back. Two years later, during the documenta X exhibition, he employed a man whose job it was to act as his alter ego. Throughout the event, his double lived in a camper van in a local park and walked around in a specially made space suit.[8]

Already in these early practices a search for one's own place, but also for the experience of the foreign, emerges. In Althamer's community projects, which he has mainly been carrying out since 2000, this search for a universalistic language or experience that opens up to the future becomes even more urgent. The *Common Task* project (combined with a local spinoff called *Dreamer*) from 2009, for example, served as an exploration of a space that is both alien and concrete: an urban living environment without anchorage in the rules and order of the present or the past (like a cultural identity). The astronauts appear here as explorers of or travelers from a different origin and time, carrying with them the experience of a 'beyond' outside the here and now. Dressed in golden spacesuits, a group of mostly low-income or unemployed neighbors from Althamer's concrete-block hometown community went together to Brazil, Belgium and Mali and confronted themselves with the experience of being human in quite different ways, while learning about a variety of concepts of spiritual community and individual responsibility. Art historian Claire Bishop wrote about the project: "At their best, what results from all three journeys in *Common Task* is a double ethnographic investigation, not just of the Dogon [in Mali], of a Brazilian cult, and of the EU (or at least of its headquarters, Brussels) but of the Polish interface with each of these entities. […] Like the space voyage, the prolepsis of post-Communist experience, the *Common Task* trips propose a kind of out-of-body experience."[9] In the process of such projects, worlds of experience and horizons of expectation come into contact, which often point to a 'beyond' outside the human order and its limitations. The result can be an altered perception of space, but also a new sense of communion with that space and its order, which no longer feels unchangeable and contained.

Important for the observation of these assumingly individual projects is that they are quite often oriented toward collectives, to communal goals and experiences. According to Groys, such attempts are specific to Eastern European artists. In contrast to the Western notion of individual artistic projects that communicate publicly but mostly lack any desire to recruit further members or to establish a collective, "[i]n Eastern Europe, artistic projects are […] still viewed as potentially collective operations that other artists are also welcome to join"[10]. But – as Claire Bishop points out –

[8] Adam Szymczyk, "The Annotated Althamer," *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry* 5 (2002): 12–23.

[9] Claire Bishop, "Something for Everyone: The Art of Paweł Althamer," *Artforum International* 49, 6 (Feb 2011), https://www.artforum.com/print/201102/something-for-everyone-the-art-of-pawel-althamer-27406, acc. on January 20, 2022.

[10] Groys, *Back from the Future*, 330.

> [t]he fact that Althamer works collaboratively is not to be misunderstood as a return to late Soviet-style collectivism, which was just as alienating as its capitalist counterpart […]. Althamer's generation of artists is one of the last to come of age under the regime, and his multiple, overlapping collaborations seem to be a hybrid formation: endlessly seeking individual freedom (of the imagination, of expression, of spiritual belief) while also understanding this search to be collective and transformative in impetus.[11]

At the same time, however, the perspective of an avant-garde positioning that looks at the present from the future or from elsewhere offers a certain withdrawal from the logic of said present, which is a logic of commodification. Accordingly, practices of self-seclusion, i.e., the exclusion of one's own position from the here and now, were already widespread in Central and Eastern European artists' groups of the 1960s and 1970s. These groups were seeking strategies of withdrawal from and confrontation with the repressive political and art- ideological system of socialism by means of conceptualist and linguistic approaches that enabled a collective processing of the experience of socialist reality with only little expenditure of resources.

As an example, I will refer to some of the actions of the Slovenian artists' group OHO. Between 1966 and 1971, OHO opposed the socialist and Catholic nationalist order in multi-ethnic Yugoslavia and sought a connection to global movements of pop culture and transgressive liberation movements. An essential means that the founding members of the group Marko Pogačnik, Milenko Matanović, David Nez and Andraž Šalamun rediscovered was the structuralist-linguistic tactic of *reism*: they saw objects and things – in criticism of the representational order of communism as well as the transcendental order of Catholicism – solely and strictly as things, nothing more.[12] Any symbolic, metaphorical, theoretical, theological and ideological aspects of reception were completely abandoned in favour of a purely phenomenological view of reality. The art historian and theoretician Miško Šuvaković stated on this 'reistic' practice that criticized humanist conceptions of the world:

> Moreover, representations of phenomenalities of the world were rendered through a radical and reductionist structural return to the *objects themselves*. [… This] meant a literal expression of the object and aspects of objecthood, indeed emphasizing the features if the specific media of artistic expression: line in drawing, letters in writing, etc. […]

[11] Bishop, *Something for Everyone*.

[12] For a theoretical account of the ideas and works of OHO as well as of many original materials and texts by its members see Miško Šuvaković, *The Clandestine Histories of the OHO Group* (Ljubljana: P.A.R.A.S.I.T.E., 2010). For the semantic and philosophical tradition of *reism* – that had its philosophical and logical origins in the Lvov-Warsaw-School and found its most famous utilisation in the Russian avant-garde – see Jan Woleński, "Reism," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2020 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta, https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/reism/, acc. on January 20, 2022.

> indicat[ing] that an object emerging before one's eyes, or a word uttered to one's ears, *is* the object or the sound, respectively.[13]

Consequently, this explicitly included the human body and the concept of the modern subject, which they playfully tested. David Nez, for example, devoted himself to the graphical study of *Cannons* (1969) as aesthetic objects, which he approached as both military and literary-linguistic phenomena and translated into their outlines: actual lines that do not subordinate themselves to representation (i.e., the naming or imitation of weapons) but assert their independence *as lines*, as a visual poetry, published in OHO's own journal *Problemi*. In doing so, however, he did not deny their context – a militaristic culture, ready to defend socialism with actual weapons. In the same year, Andraž Šalamun designed a *Forest* (*Gozd*, 1969) consisting of soft artificial leather sculptures that had an inherent erotic component alongside their allusions to nature and retreat. They were built into the spatial arrangement of a studio that provided a place for different inanimate and living bodies to come into contact with each other. In this way, and through the objects' ambivalence of form between cactuses, benches, or sofas and *phalloi*, transgressing the boundaries between object and subject, the installation played with obvious ambiguities in the realms of sensuality, civilized societal behaviour and bodily interaction.

Less publicly, collective actions such as Šalamun's *Kama Sutra* (1969) were carried out in private and documented, to be published later in *Problemi*. Naked anonymous bodies, imitating different positions from the (in)famous Indian treatise on desire and enjoyment, were photographed under open air in the quite indifferent setting of trees and meadows. The human bodies as 'natural' objects, which at the same time became objects of appropriation for the camera and the voyeuristic gaze, are exhibited here as the instruments and material of a body art situation. Concurrently, within the images made of the action on the Srakane islands, cultural attributions of gender, sex and identity were evaluated in an ambiguous manner – an in itself subversive act in the socialist-modernist context, where ambivalences and non-binary concepts of identity must have been perceived as highly suspicious. This also occurs in the mini-action *Egg, Smashed Egg* by David Nez (1969) – another photographic endeavor into making objects and subjects alike. On the first of two images a hand holding an egg is to be seen, while the second shows the smashed egg down on the floor, accompanied by the shoe of (probably) the same person. The unmotivated violence and image of death in this aesthetic experiment call up layers of experience deeply rooted in existing socialism. At the same time, these are presented in such an unspectacular and disinterested way that the aggression underlying them evaporates into an aesthetic amazement about the forms of the egg and its remains. As demonstrated by this objectified life form, many of OHO's works make the arbitrariness of human existence as an experience of objectification (to the nation state, to nature, to other humans) palpable. From there, it is only a small step to a perspective of complete non-existence.

[13] Šuvaković, *The Clandestine Histories*, 28.

A couple of years later, in the Soviet Union, the group Gnezdo (*Nest*), consisting of Viktor Skersis, Gennadij Donskoj und Michail Rošal', organised a similar series of actions in Moscow and its surrounding area. They confronted visual icons of socialist realism, which focused exclusively on humanity and its social, cultural and political progress, with their pathological as well as their corporeal counterparts. Their neo-avant-garde and neo-surrealist strategies for coping with the specific conditions of production, critique, and reception of art and/in the public sphere often immediately dealt with 'official' imagery and concepts of gestural body usage in the mode of (mock) imitation and repetition. The actions *The Fertilisation of Earth* or *Help to the Soviet State in the Struggle for Harvest* (both 1976), for example, deal both with paragons from the aesthetic paradigm of Socialist Realism – like oil paintings by Arkadij Plastov or Andrej Myl'nikov – and with the apocryphal phantasma of a rural 'Mother Russia' and complement their empowering gestures of virility and subjugation of nature with an experience of non-sovereignty.[14] By re-enacting these iconic works on sowing, harvesting and haymaking with their own imperfect bodies, Gnezdo members interrogated the pictorial impact of their templates on the discourse on art and culture in general. Furthermore, by getting these images literally into movement, they also questioned the usual heroic and mostly static representations of bodies (of workers, peasants, and sportsmen) that were dominating socialist-realistic artworks.[15] The widespread collective fantasy of human supremacy is questioned and exposed here in its collision with the experience of industrial division of labour both in the big cities and in the collective farms.

Another group, called SZ (Viktor Skersis and Vadim Zakharov), dealt in its own way with the *objets trouvés* of socialist everyday life as well as with the body and its conditioning through socialist drill. They transformed simple and cheap everyday objects such as matches (*Serija anatomija sliček*, later *Pornografičeskaja serija*, 1980) or frying pans into anatomical-erotic objects that promised both traumatic and pleasurable experiences (*Produkcija SZ: Bodalki; Kovyrjalka, trykalka, tykalka*, 1980).[16] The corporeality of such projects, negotiating the socialist world of things and its corresponding psychological constitution, was something completely new and disturbing to the contemporaries of Skersis and Zakharov. Sergej Anufriev, himself an artist of the second generation of Moscow Conceptualism and co-founder of the 'Inspection

[14] For these and some other Gnezdo actions, see Leonid Taločkin and Irina Alpatova, ed. by *Drugoe Iskusstvo. Moskva 1956–76*, 2 volumes (Moscow: Chudožestvennaja Galereja 'Moskovskaja Kollekcija', 1991), I.186, I.242, I.255, II.69.

[15] See Hans Günther, "The Heroic Myth in Socialist Realism," in *Dream Factory Communism: The Visual Culture of the Stalin Era*, ed. by Boris Groys and Max Hollein (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2003), 106–24, and Nina Sobol Levent, *Healthy Spirit in a Healthy Body: Representations of the Sports Body in Soviet Art of the 1920s and 1930s* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004), 68ff, 145ff.

[16] For material on the SZ group as well as some self-explanatory texts by Vadim Zakharov see Alexandra Oboukhova, ed. *SZ Group. Viktor Skersis – Vadim Zakharov. Collaboration* (Moscow: E.K.ArtBureau, 2004). For an account of Zakharov's early conceptualist works and actions see Micha Braun, "'A ›body art‹ that did not fit'. Körper und Gesten in den frühen Arbeiten Vadim Zakharovs," in *Leibesvisitationen. Der Körper als mediales Politikum in den (post)sozialistischen Kulturen und Literaturen*, ed. by Torsten Erdbrügger and Stephan Krause (Heidelberg: Winter, 2014), 103–21.

Medical Hermeneutics', described his experiences with SZ as an "actualization of latent states, […] growing into pathology"[17]. Objects were thus not only attributed a secret life of their own in addition to their mere usability by humans. Even more so, these objects threatened the human body and its own usability by not only referring to its repressed animalistic-libidinous levels of experience – and thus its boundedness to nature – but also by decisively reversing the perspective of the desirer and the object of desire. Here, the human body was viewed from the perspective of things as an object of pleasure and use, and non-human phenomena were attributed a capacity for enjoyment beyond the horizon of human experience.

Plenty of Hope – But Not for Us. What If Things Took Over?

In summary, the neo-avant-garde practices of Central and Eastern Europe from the 1960s to the 1980s demonstrated a recurrent engagement with objects and landscapes that were 'animated' by means of performative (linguistic) acts in order to address a 'beyond' of the verbal, the visual and thus the political order. What would happen however, what would the world look like, if this order (of things) gained the upper hand? In what ways are things instrumentalized in utility-based modernity, and what might an opposing model of a non-instrumental encounter look like?

In the last part of this paper, I will argue that such considerations do not stem solely from confrontation with the project of socialist modernity, but have their roots even further back, in the historical avant-garde. The confrontation of the modern paradigm of rationality and machinated progress with more poetical-reformist analyses of the present already played a major role in the literary and theatrical practices of the early 1900s. Even before World War I, the crisis-like constitution of everyday life for both bourgeois and more proletarian strata of society was palpable[18] – but this was of course fundamentally intensified by the experience of the mechanization of war and the decentring of the individual in their role as soldier or civilian.

A lasting impression of this intensified perception of crisis was conveyed in Karel Čapek's drama *R.U.R.*, which was published in 1920 and immediately performed many times worldwide. After its world premiere in Hradec Králové and at the Prague National Theatre immediately afterwards in January 1921, it had already been translated into thirty languages by 1923.[19] The name of the play stands for "Rossum's Universal Robots", a factory on a desert island that produces artificial humans for worldwide export. The name of the company's founder Rossum is an allusion to the Slavic word *rozum/razum*, meaning reason or intellect, while 'robot' refers to *robota*, which means compulsory labour.

---

[17] Anufriev, in Oboukhova, *SZ Group*, 23.

[18] See e.g., Philipp Blom, *The Vertigo Years: Europe 1900–1914* (New York: Basic Books, 2008).

[19] See, especially for the reception in the English-speaking world, Peter Kussi, ed. *Toward the Radical Center: A Karel Čapek Reader* (Highland Park, New Jersey: Catbird Press, 1990), 11–25.

What is essential in Čapek's drama is that the robots referred to here are not machine-structured operational units or apparatuses, but rather animate, non-human beings based on organic structures and an unspecified proto-plasmic life force (which would make them *androids* in today's parlance). The play describes – from the inside perspective of the factory – the worldwide use of these artificial humans as cheap and lawless workers. Their massive industrial deployment changes the entire world economy over time and is intended to serve a quasi-communist ideal state of a human race liberated from labour.

As the play progresses, however, the robots rebel and destroy humanity in order to rule as the much more efficient beings, feeling entitled to live on earth alone. At the same time, however, they cannot reproduce without human help, leading to a conflict of goals that can only be resolved by an unintended modification of the androids. The drama ends with the outlook that the last surviving human named Alquist and a few 'good' robots, who were given a kind of retroactive update by a now murdered engineer and are capable of both empathy and mutual affection, might establish a new family tree, a new kind of existence on earth.

What is evoked here, then, is a life force that is explicitly not exhausted in humanity but finds and makes possible the existence of creativity and love on the one hand, and competitive thinking and the will to destroy on the other, in the material or non-human. The portrayal of the androids as soul-less and sterile beings without history and, above all, without a future, who – just like humans, by the way – see their goal in life only in the optimization of work and production processes, is both an impressive description of crisis and a bitter satire on designs of community associated both with left- and right-wing ideologies.[20] At the same time, however, the play engages with reflections on humanity and its possible end in general. Essential questions in the protagonists' arguments are: How will mankind be remembered after its end? Was it worthwhile to have been human? Was there any other way than the self-extinction of humanity by means of hubris and strategic violence?

This fundamentally anthropological experience of looking forward to and reconciling with finitude is shared by humans and androids in Čapek's work. Their consumption of resources is just as ineffective as that of humans, and the fundamental lack of reproductive capacity virtually 'builds in' the obsolescence of this form of life from the outset. At the same time, however, the critic Nicholas Anderson derives an enormous hope from this, which I would like to endorse here:

> For me, the promise held in the ending of Čapek's play lies in the indeterminacy with which Alquist deploys the word 'life' and his subsequent reaffirmation of humanity's disappearance along with all of its works. As Kafka once said, there is 'plenty of hope, an infinite amount of hope – but not for us' […]. There may be no hope, no apocalyptic revelation in the

[20] On Čapek's philosophical and ironic stance to political ideologies – at least before the dawn of fascism – see e.g., Josef Šlerka, "Karel Čapek – pragmatista a ironic," *Word & Sense* 1 (2004), http://slovoasmysl.ff.cuni.cz/node/16, acc. on January 20, 2022.

> catastrophe of our extinction, yet there may very well be infinite hope for the generation of new life posthumous to humankind.[21]

This could be built upon, I think – and we would have to start (at the latest) today. The OHO group and the artist groups of Moscow Conceptualism already in the 1960s and 1970s granted things and other non-human co-inhabitants on earth a 'life of their own' – and thus promoted them from a pure object, from a quantity of appropriation to be perceived only by humans, into a counterpart of their own right. Under the conditions of an authoritative psychological and political system, this was an act of self-defense and at the same time foresight. Just like Čapek's protagonists in 1920, as well as Paweł Althamer's figures of astronauts and travelers, our task today would be to take a look from the future and to advance the recognition of the object status of humans as well as their finiteness. This could take place in a *Theatre of the Anthropocene* in the sense of the German dramaturg and publicist Frank Raddatz and the ocean biologist Antje Boetius.[22] The human being as the core and pivot of drama and art requires some "heuristic de-centration", because "[t]he planet does not need humans, but humans need the non-human life on the planet"[23]. If views from outside and from afar – be they astronautic, robotic, or just views from the future – help us to bring this cognitive process to an apperceptive acknowledgement and representation, they will be most welcome.

References

Anderson, Nicholas. "'Only We Have Perished': Karel Čapek's R.U.R. and the Catastrophe of Humankind." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 25 2/3 (2014), 226–46.

Bishop, Claire. "Something for Everyone: The Art of Paweł Althamer." *Artforum International* 49, 6 (Feb 2011). https://www.artforum.com/print/201102/something-for-everyone-the-art-of-pawel-althamer-27406. Accessed on January 20, 2022.

Blom, Philipp. *The Vertigo Years: Europe 1900–1914.* New York: Basic Books, 2008.

Braun, Micha. "'A ›body art‹ that did not fit'. Körper und Gesten in den frühen Arbeiten Vadim Zakharovs." In *Leibesvisitationen. Der Körper als mediales Politikum in den (post)sozialistischen Kulturen und Literaturen*, edited by Torsten Erdbrügger and Stephan Krause, 103–21. Heidelberg: Winter, 2014.

Groys, Boris. "Back from the Future." *Third Text* 17, 4 (2003): 323–31.

Günther, Hans. "The Heroic Myth in Socialist Realism." In *Dream Factory Communism: The Visual Culture of the Stalin Era*, edited by Boris Groys and Max Hollein, 106–124. Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2003.

[21] Nicholas Anderson, "'Only We Have Perished': Karel Čapek's R.U.R. and the Catastrophe of Humankind," *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 25, 2/3 (2014): 242f.

[22] See the project description at http://theater-des-anthropozän.de/en/the-theatre/, acc. on January 20, 2022.

[23] Frank-M. Raddatz, *Das Drama des Anthropozän* (Berlin: Theater der Zeit, 2021), 99. My translation.

Kussi, Peter, ed. *Toward the Radical Center: A Karel* Čapek *Reader.* Highland Park, New Jersey: Catbird Press, 1990.

Lubiak, Jarosław. "Paweł Althamer." In *Nowe zjawiska w sztuce polskiej po 2000 roku*, edited by Grzegorz Borkowski, Adam Mazur and Monika Branicka, 158–63. Warsaw: CSW Zamek Ujazdowski, 2008.

Oboukhova, Alexandra ed. *SZ Group. Viktor Skersis – Vadim Zakharov. Collaboration.* Moscow: E.K.ArtBureau, 2004.

Przywara, Andrzej. "Paweł Althamer." In *Na wolności w końcu – Sztuka polska po 1989 roku*, edited by Dorota Monkiewicz and Dirk Teuber, 23–28. Baden-Baden, Warsaw: Staatliche Kunsthalle Baden-Baden, Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, 2000.

Raddatz, Frank-M. *Das Drama des Anthropozän.* Berlin: Theater der Zeit, 2021.

Sobol Levent, Nina. *Healthy Spirit in a Healthy Body: Representations of the Sports Body in Soviet Art of the 1920s and 1930s.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004.

Šlerka, Josef. "Karel Čapek – pragmatista a ironic." *Word & Sense* 1 (2004). http://slovoasmysl.ff.cuni.cz/node/16. Accessed on January 20, 2022.

Sural, Agnieszka. "11 Greatest Works of Paweł Althamer." https://culture.pl/en/article/11-greatest-works-of-pawel-althamer. Accessed on January 20, 2022.

Šuvaković, Miško. *The Clandestine Histories of the OHO Group.* Ljubljana: P.A.R.A.S.I.T.E., 2010.

Szymczyk, Adam. "The Annotated Althamer." *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry* 5 (2002): 12–23. doi: 10.2307/20711454

Taločkin, Leonid and Irina Alpatova, ed. *Drugoe Iskusstvo. Moskva 1956–76*, 2 volumes. Moscow: Chudožestvennaja Galereja 'Moskovskaja Kollekcija', 1991.

Woleński, Jan. "Reism." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2020 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/reism/. Accessed on January 20, 2022.

Article received: December 12, 2021
Article accepted: February 1, 2022
Original scholarly article